

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to the entry of this amendment, claims 1-13, 16-19, 21-27, 35-37, 40, 42-45, and 50-57 were pending in this application. No claims are amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added herein. Therefore, claims 1-13, 16-19, 21-27, 35-37, 40, 42-45, and 50-57 remain pending in this application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of these claims for at least the reasons presented below.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection, Hassett and Bull in view of Krapf

The Office Action has rejected claims 1-4, 7-13, 16-19, 21-27, 35-37, 40, 42-45, and 50-57 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,173,311 B1 of Hassett et al. (hereinafter "Hassett") and U. S. Patent No. 5,901,287 of Bull et al. (hereinafter "Bull") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,901,588 B1 of Krapf et al. (hereinafter "Krapf"). The Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting these claims, as amended. Therefore, the Applicant requests reconsideration of these claims, as amended.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Office Action must establish: 1) some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or combine their teachings; 2) a reasonable expectation of success of such a modification or combination; and 3) a teaching or suggestion in the cited prior art of each claimed limitation. See MPEP §706.02(j). However, the cited references fail to teach or suggest, alone or in combination, each claimed limitation. For example, none of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest multiple data stores each having a agent and a profile representing configuration information for the data store, the agents and profiles being mapped one-to-one,

creating a temporary proxy, or accessing a data store via the associated agent from the temporary proxy based on the profiles.

Hassett is directed to "servicing of client requests on a network." (Col. 1, lines 15-16) Under Hassett, "HTTP GET requests from client computers are served by assigned agents on the caching proxy server." (Col. 7, lines 13-15) "When a GET request is received by the caching proxy server, the category id of the request is examined to determine which agent on the caching proxy server should serve the request." (Col. 7, line 29-32) That is, under Hassett, the agent used to process a request is determined by information (i.e., the category ID) in the request, from the client. (See also FIG. 5A) The category ID from the request is based on the last information sent to the client. (Col. 5, lines 35-36, col. 9, lines 9-33, col. 19, line 10 - col. 22, line 35) However, Hassett does not teach or suggest multiple data stores each having a agent and a profile representing configuration information for the data store, the agents and profiles being mapped one-to-one, creating a temporary proxy, or accessing a data store via the associated agent from the temporary proxy based on the profiles. Furthermore, it is noted that the final Office Action correctly indicates that Hassett does not teach "each data store having a dedicated agent for interacting with the data store and a profiles (sic) mapping one-to-one with the dedicated agent and representing configuration information for the data store." (page 3, para. no. 5, last sentence)

The final Office Action then introduces Bull to demonstrate this element that is clearly not taught by Hassett. However, the applicants respectfully argue that Bull also fails to teach or suggest, alone or in combination with Hassett or any of the other references, multiple data stores each having a agent and a profile representing configuration information for the data store, the agents and profiles being mapped one-to-one, creating a temporary proxy, or accessing a data store via the associated agent from the temporary proxy based on the profiles.

Bull is "directed to an information aggregation and synthesization system which connects with local and network accessible datastores through an intermediary gateway system."

More specifically, under Bull "the user initiates access to the system through a network addressable interface device." (Col. 3, lines 26-27) "The user is then connected to the information aggregation and synthesization system via a network service provider." (Col. 3, lines 29-31) "The user logs on to the system either by name, address, etc. or with some pseudonym (or some combination)." (Col. 3, lines 32-34) "This allows the user's activity to be tracked and establishes a log of the user's activity during the current online experience (session)." (Col. 3, lines 34-36) "The user is also asked for explicit profile information concerning preferences." (Col. 3, lines 36-38) "These preferences will be used to narrow the information retrieval and may be collected when the user first logs in or incrementally as the user asks for specific information." (Col. 3, lines 38-41) That is, Bull discloses tracking a user's access of information, i.e., his surfing habits, and builds a set of preferences based thereon. This information is then used to update the user's profile and the profile can in turn be used to provide customized searches based on the user's profile. (col. 4, lines 28-33)

The agents of Bull cited by the Office Action provide for monitoring of a user's actions and, when a certain pattern is detected, provide a target advertisement. (Col. 4, line 62 - col. 5, line 10) The portion of Bull cited by the Office Action, i.e., col. 14, lines 21-32, actually describes a data store for storing such agents. However, the functions of the agents remain monitoring a user's actions and providing a target advertisement based thereon, not teach or suggest using the agents to access the data store. Furthermore, Bull does not teach or suggest each data store having an agent. For example, Bull does not teach or suggest the "lead data store" of FIG. 3 having an agent for accessing that store.

Therefore, Bull does not teach or suggest multiple data stores each having a agent and a profile representing configuration information for the data store, the agents and profiles being mapped one-to-one, creating a temporary proxy, or accessing a data store via the associated agent from the temporary proxy based on the profiles. Rather, the profiles of Bull are related to individual users, not the individual data stores. Furthermore, the agents of Bull

monitor the actions of the user and provide a targeted advertisement based thereon, they do not provide access to an associated data store.

Krapf relates to "a method and apparatus for representing and implementing a concept between two functional domains (e.g., programming languages) by using a proxy component in a first domain to wrap a component of a second domain, where the proxy component has a semantic usability in the first domain closely corresponding to the semantic usability of the underlying component from the second domain." (Col. 2, lines 8-15) "Such proxy components may be used to gradually transform a digital entity (e.g., a software application) from a first domain to a second domain." (Col. 2, lines 16-19) However, Krapf does not teach or suggest multiple data stores each having a agent and a profile representing configuration information for the data store, the agents and profiles being mapped one-to-one, creating a temporary proxy, or accessing a data store via the associated agent from the temporary proxy based on the profiles.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-4 and 7-17 depend, relate to a method of supporting multiple data stores for an integrated access system and identity system. Claim 35, upon which claims 36-39 depend, relates to one or more processor readable storage devices having processor readable code embodied on said processor readable storage devices, said processor readable code for programming one or more processors to perform a method. Both claim 1 and claim 35 recite in part "receiving a request at said integrated access system and identity system, said integrated access system and identity system supporting a plurality of data stores, each data store having a dedicated agent for interacting with the data store and a profile mapping one-to-one with the dedicated agent and representing configuration information for the data store; determining based on the profiles which data stores can service said request; creating a temporary proxy with one or more pointers to agents associated with said data stores that can service said request; accessing data stores that can service said request via the agent for the one or more data stores from the temporary proxy; reporting via the temporary proxy information

based on said step of accessing; and terminating the temporary proxy." None of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest multiple data stores each having a dedicated agent and a profile mapping one-to-one with the dedicated agent and representing configuration information for the data store, creating a temporary proxy, or accessing a data store via the associated agent from the temporary proxy based on the profiles. Rather, Hassett teaches determining an agent to process a request based on information (i.e., the category ID) in the request, the information in the request based on the last information sent to the client while Bull teaches monitoring a users actions and providing targeted advertisements based thereon and Krapf teaches porting software between environments or domains using a proxy to encapsulate the ported component. For at least these reasons, claim 1-7, 7-17, and 35-39 should be allowed.

Claim 18, upon which claims 19-27 depend, relates to a method of supporting multiple data stores. Claim 40, upon which claims 41-45 depend, relates to one or more processor readable storage devices having processor readable code embodied on said processor readable storage devices, said processor readable code for programming one or more processors to perform a method. Both claim 18 and claim 40 recite in part "receiving a request to access one or more of a plurality of data stores, each data store having a profile representing configuration information for the data store; determining based on the profiles which data stores can service said request, each data store is associated with a separate agent, wherein each agent is mapped one-to-one with the profile for the associated data store; creating a temporary proxy with one or more pointers to agents associated with said data stores that can service said request; accessing said data stores that can service said request by communicating with said associated agents via the temporary proxy." None of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest multiple data stores each having a dedicated agent and a profile mapping one-to-one with the dedicated agent and representing configuration information for the data store, creating a temporary proxy, or accessing a data store via the associated agent from the temporary proxy based on the profiles. Rather, Hassett teaches determining an agent to process a request based on information (i.e., the category ID) in the request, the information in the request based on the last

information sent to the client while Bull teaches monitoring a users actions and providing targeted advertisements based thereon and Krapf teaches porting software between environments or domains using a proxy to encapsulate the ported component. For at least these reasons, claim 18-27 and 40-45 should be allowed.

Claim 50, upon which claims 51-54 depend, relates to an apparatus that supports multiple data stores. Claim 50 recites in part "receiving a request to access one or more of a plurality of data stores, each data store having a dedicated agent for interacting with the data store and a profile representing configuration information for the data store; determining based on the profiles which data stores can service said request, creating a temporary proxy having knowledge of agents for the data stores can service said request; using said proxy to access said data stores that can service said request via the agents, reporting information based on said step of accessing, and terminating the temporary proxy." None of the references teach or suggest, alone or in combination, multiple data stores each having a agent and a profile representing configuration information for the data store, creating a temporary proxy, or accessing a data store via the associated agent from the temporary proxy based on the profiles. For at least these reasons, claims 50-54 should be allowed.

Claim 55, upon which claims 56 and 57 depend, relates to a system that supports multiple data stores. Claim 55 recites in part " a set of profiles, each profile associated with one of said data stores and wherein each profile represents configuration information for the data store; a set of agents, each agent associated with one of said data stores and adapted to facilitate communications with the data store; a temporary proxy; and a database manager, said database manager in communication with said profiles, wherein said database manager is adapted to receive a request to access one or more of the data stores, determine based on the profiles which data store can service the request and wherein said database manager creates said proxy in response to the request to access said data stores and causes said proxy to be in communication with agents associated with data stores that can service said request based on the profiles." None

of the references teach or suggest, alone or in combination, multiple data stores each having a agent and a profile representing configuration information for the data store, creating a temporary proxy, or accessing a data store via the associated agent from the temporary proxy based on the profiles. Rather, Hassett teaches determining an agent to process a request based on information (i.e., the category ID) in the request, the information in the request based on the last information sent to the client while Bull teaches monitoring a users actions and providing targeted advertisements based thereon and Krapf teaches porting software between environments or domains using a proxy to encapsulate the ported component. For at least these reasons, claims 55-57 should be allowed.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection, Hassett and Bull in view of Brown

The Office Action has rejected claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hassett and Bull in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,678,733 B1 of Brown et al. (hereinafter "Brown"). The Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting these claims. Therefore, the Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

As discussed in detail above, claim 1, upon which claims 5 and 6 depend, is distinguishable from the combination of Hassett and Bull since neither reference, alone or in combination teaches or suggests multiple data stores each having a dedicated agent and a profile mapping one-to-one with the dedicated agent and representing configuration information for the data store, creating a temporary proxy, or accessing a data store via the associated agent from the temporary proxy based on the profiles.

Brown is directed to " a method and system that authenticates users and authorizes the users to access a walled garden of network services." (Col. 2, lines 15-17) Under Brown " When a user wishes to access a service in the walled garden, the client sends a hypertext transport protocol (HTTP) request to the WGPS identifying the plot number of the requested

service. If the client has a ticket granting access to the walled garden, the client includes the ticket in an authorization header." (Col. 2, line 66 - col. 3, line 4) " In response to a denial, the client sends a message to the GS requesting a ticket. The user authenticates himself or herself to the client by providing authentication information and the client provides this information to the GS." (Col. 3, lines 7-10) That is, Brown provides access to controlled resources based on a ticket or key provided by a client. However, Brown does not teach or suggest multiple data stores each having a dedicated agent and a profile mapping one-to-one with the dedicated agent and representing configuration information for the data store, creating a temporary proxy, or accessing a data store via the associated agent from the temporary proxy based on the profiles.

The combination of Hassett, Bulland Brown is no more relevant to the pending claims than either reference alone. None of the references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest multiple data stores each having a dedicated agent and a profile mapping one-to-one with the dedicated agent and representing configuration information for the data store, creating a temporary proxy, or accessing a data store via the associated agent from the temporary proxy based on the profiles. Therefore, the references cited in the Office Action fail to teach or suggest each claimed limitation. For at least these reasons, claims 5 and 6 should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/998,908

PATENT

Amdt. dated: October 20, 2006

Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure

Examining Group 2144

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Dated: October 20, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



William J. Daley
Reg. No. 52,471

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000 (Denver)
Fax: 303-571-4321 (Denver)

WJD:sbm

60861784 v1